The Ten Fallacies of Conventional Pulp Linguistics

Kaan Arslanoğlu

October 15, 2025

We say that at the root of European languages lies a strong presence of Turkish. We say that English, German, the Latin-based languages like French, Spanish, and Italian, as well as the northern, Nordic tongues—all have Turkish at their foundation. They are stunned. We add: Turkish is not just an ordinary element in the roots of these languages, it is their very founder. Then they feel insulted. Let me say this upfront. Crazy but totally true. Of course, these claims are not easy to swallow for those hearing them for the first time.

They respond: “What ignorance, what an arrogant disrespect for science!” That’s their first reaction. Some even go further, accusing us of nationalism or racism, and start swearing.

Those who manage to stay somewhat calm and try to argue against our bold claims usually bring up one or more of the ten clichés we’ve long memorized. Without knowing any of the basic facts on the subject, they indulge in that hedonism of believing they know something for certain—within the magnificent ignorance of so-called linguistics. This is what the blindness of the majority looks like.

So then, let’s take a look at the ten clichés of so-called linguistics.

THE COINCIDENCE FALLACY

We show roots and words that perfectly match in both meaning and sound between Turkish and European languages. They say, “It’s just coincidence.” We

show more examples, and they repeat, “Coincidence—there can be many coincidences.” They say, “Every language has words that resemble those of others.”

I have published about twenty thousand common words. Yet there are still those who keep saying, “Coincidence.”

If there is one thing certain in linguistics, it is this: if even seven words from the basic vocabulary—say, from the Swadesh list—match perfectly, that indicates a genetic relationship between the two languages.

In my studies using the Swadesh list, I found roughly 30 to 45 percent overlap between Turkish and various Western languages. Scientifically speaking, the probability of such similarity being coincidental is close to zero.

However, the bias of those who still call it “coincidence” is certainly no coincidence.

For further reading: (1, 2, 3)

THE “LOANWORD” FALLACY

One of the most frequently invoked concepts in mainstream linguistics is that of the “loanword” — the notion that words can be “borrowed” between languages. Whenever the issue of strong lexical or root correspondences between two languages arises, many scholars tend to explain such parallels through this framework. This explanation, while convenient and widely accepted, often serves as a ready-made response that prevents deeper inquiry into alternative historical or structural connections.

Readers of such writers will say: “Ah, how brilliant! Our genius author has discovered that peoples have always interacted throughout history. And of

course, when that happens, some words will be exchanged — traded like cattle in a market, or like women in a slave bazaar… Words, too, can be bought and sold."

By accepting this, one simultaneously underscores the eternal interconnectedness of nations and contributes to a liberal narrative of brotherhood, while also reinforcing a pseudo-liberatory discourse through the idea of linguistic and cultural exchange. And there is a third bird killed with this same stone: should anyone — for instance, someone like me — attempt to demonstrate the Turkic roots of Western languages, the argument has already been preemptively neutralized.

"Yes," they will say, "some words may be shared, but these are merely loanwords… words borrowed in limited numbers during later periods, long after the formation of the two entirely distinct languages belonging to completely different families."

Is it really that simple?

Loanwords do indeed exist — but they are, by definition, relatively recent formations. They are words exchanged within the past few centuries — four or five hundred years at most. They are rarely core vocabulary items; rather, they tend to be names of newly emerged objects, novel concepts, or technical terms.

In contrast, about ninety percent of the roughly twenty thousand words I have catalogued are among the most ancient lexical items — words that emerged during the formative stages of languages. They are basic vocabulary. **And most of them are not isolated words standing alone in either language (or at least not in Turkish); they belong to clusters of related words, all derived from the**

same root, forming lexical families. How many of those who routinely invoke this cliché, I wonder, are capable of understanding the conceptual framework I am trying to outline here? That is an other problem.

Moreover, if there are tens of thousands of loanwords between Turkish and other languages, shouldn't Turkish be considered to be in the same family as these languages - according to their own logic?

Let me provide just twelve examples each of words related to **human body parts, animal names** and **verbs** that are of Turkic origin or shared between Turkish and Western languages. The most immediate examples that come to mind are:

Cardia, kardia, heart < **cörök, yürek** / **Cephal** < **kafa** (head) / **Derma** < **deri** / **Ulna, elbow** < **el** (hand, arm) / **Keri, cheri** (Greek) < **karı** (arm, hand) / **Guts, gut** < **göt** / **Nose** < **nüz** / **Belly** < **bel** / **Omos** (Greek) < **omuz** / **Chest, cage** < **kögüs, göğüs** / **Mamma, mamilla, mammal** < **meme** / **Foot** < **but** (The number of organ names in European languages common to Turkish is more than 40).

Dog < **tayğan, dayğan** / **Cat** < **kedi** / **Ox** < **öküz** / **Crow** < **karga** / **Bug** < **böcek, böcü** / **Ass** < **eşek** / **Goat, geiss** < **geçi, keçi** / **Cow** < **kap, kov, koy, koyun** / **Leopard** < **bars, pars** / **Elk** < **elik** / **Areneus, arachne** < **örümcek** / **Goose** < **kaz** (The number of animal names in European languages common to Turkish is more than 40).

Say < **söyle** / **Tell** < **de** / **Curve** < **kıvır** / **Bind, bond** < **bağla, ban** / **Turn** < **dön, tur** / **Get** < **git, getir, götür** / **Peek** < **bak** / **Tact** < **tokun, dokun** / **Tag, attach** < **tak** / **Eat, edo** < **ide, yut** / **Heal** < **iyileş** / **Able** < **abil**-mek, yap-**abil**mek … (The number of verbs in European languages common to Turkish is more than 200).

THE “LANGUAGE FAMILY” FALLACY

Whenever I speak of any form of linguistic commonality between Turkish and another language, one of those linguists who still carry the temperament of an overeager elementary school student (or some self-taught intellectual who has memorized a few sentences from such scholars) hastens to remind me of a dreadful “fact”:

“The language you mention belongs to the Indo-European family, whereas Turkish belongs to an entirely different one — the Ural-Altaic family.”

These linguists act as though they were parish priests keeping genealogical records: they can instantly tell you which language “belongs” to which “family.” And they all share a peculiar trait — they assume you are unaware of even the alphabet of their discipline. It is reminiscent of that caricature in which someone tries to teach Einstein basic arithmetic while he is explaining quantum equations.

The Indo-European hypothesis and the notion of an Indo-European “language family” are, in truth, artificial, inconsistent, weak, and inherently racialist ideas. I reject these classifications entirely — and I do so based on the writings of the great scholars who came before me. There are profound differences among the so-called Indo-European languages: in syntax, in grammar, and in basic lexical structure. Of course, there are similarities as well, but in some cases the similarities among Indo-European languages are weaker than those between them and, say, Arabic or Hebrew.

Turkish, by contrast, is akin to the foundational language of what are today called the Indo-European tongues. Latin, for instance, can be viewed as a

dialect of Turkish. Among the languages categorized as Indo-European, Sanskrit, Dravidian and Hittite most closely resemble Turkish.

The Turkic, or Turanian, languages are agglutinative languages — older than inflectional languages and, in fact, their ancestors. Max Müller, once regarded as a great master of linguistics and one of the founders of the Indo-European theory itself, explicitly acknowledged this truth.

The regions of Asia that are claimed to be the homeland of Indo-European languages were, both then and now, Turkish lands. There is no "lost people." The so-called Indo-European or Aryan peoples were in fact proto-Turks, Turanians, Turkic in origin. The nations and languages of today are simply continuations of that same lineage.

Inflectional languages evolved from agglutinative ones — through the hybridization of peoples and languages. The inflectional Indo-European category is thus a relatively recent formation: a hybrid development that, in grammatical and expressive terms, represents a regression. Hybrid peoples formed creole languages, which exerted pressure toward the simplest possible means of expression. The result was a kind of "Pidgin-like" grammatical simplification. **Yet within this grammar, numerous structural traces of Turkic grammar remained, imprinted like enduring marks.**

For further reading: (4)

THE "DIFFERENT ETYMOLOGY" FALLACY

When I present a word shared between Turkish and languages such as German, English, Italian, or French, they immediately point to one of its earliest recorded forms. If that form appears in Ancient Greek, Latin, Hindi, or Sanskrit,

they exclaim triumphantly: “See? That’s the original root. These are Indo-European languages — it cannot possibly have any connection to Turkish.”

At that point, I show them hundreds, even thousands, of words shared between Turkish and Latin, Greek, or Sanskrit. I demonstrate how these words possess an internal conceptual history within Turkish — how they form clusters by generating one another through morphological and semantic derivation. I do the same for Arabic, Persian, and Hebrew. At that stage, their “different etymology” argument collapses entirely.

I have published hundreds of examples showing that many so-called Proto-Indo-European root words are, in fact, of Turkish origin. (5)

THE “SOUND CHANGE RULES” FALLACY

Indo-European linguistic theorists attach great importance to the so-called “laws of sound change,” because they need such rules to justify alleged relationships between words that bear little or no phonetic resemblance. Through these “rules,” they sometimes ascribe kinship to words that are utterly unrelated. Within the Indo-European family, any sound shift can be invoked to prove common ancestry.

However, when we present Turkish–European cognates that differ by even a single letter, they immediately protest: “There is absolutely no similarity!” They even object to the simplest consonant alternations — such as **b–f- m–p–v** — if the example happens to involve Turkish.

There exist roughly ten consistent phonetic laws that describe how Turkish words have changed when taken into other languages. I have published these repeatedly with extensive examples — yet they remain unaware of even one. And still they imagine they are doing “linguistics.” (6)

For instance, regarding what I call the Initial "**S Rule**", I have published about 150 examples. They cannot seem to grasp it. Just only 3 examples:

Scab, s-cab < **kab, kap, kabuk** (shell, crust)

Select, s-elect < **ele, elek** (to choose, elect, sieve)

Screw, s-kew < **kıvır, kıvrık** (to twist, curved)

What, indeed, is so hard to understand? It simply does not suit their preconceptions.

Consider another case: Old English **thou**, German **du**, and modern English **you**. These correspond to Latin **tu**; Celtic **tu, ti**; and Greek **su**. In Greek, they appear as **se, seis, eseis**. Yet when we propose that Turkish **sen** / **siz** ("you," singular/plural) is their ancestor, we are told, "That's impossible — the sounds are completely different!"

Let me give a more extreme example. English '**night**' corresponds to German **nacht**, Italian **notte**, Spanish **noche**, Scottish **oidhche**, Basque **gaua**, Russian **vecher**, and Irish **oíche**. Yet we are told there can be no phonetic connection whatsoever to Turkish "night" **geçe**, **gece** > **oiche, gaua, oidhche, noche, notte, veche**

THE "DIFFERENT GRAMMAR" FALLACY

I have already stated that, from the perspective of syntax and grammar, the so-called Indo-European languages actually developed from (or rather, degenerated from) the agglutinative structure of Turkish. I have also argued that the fundamental framework of these languages retains strong Turkic residues. For a more detailed analysis, see my related article on this subject (4).

Let me briefly illustrate this with a few examples.

Above, I mentioned the second-person singular and plural pronouns. **Se, seis, eseis** (Greek) < **sen, siz**

In English, the first-person marker **am** (as in I am) and in Latin the morpheme -**m** or **-um** correspond exactly to the Turkish first-person singular suffixes **-am, -um, -ım, -m**

Likewise, English **my, mine**, and **me** directly correspond to Turkish **men, ben, menim, ben-im** — that is, "I am," "mine," "me."

Latin syntax, for example in the phrase **Cogito ergo sum** (I think, therefore I am), follows precisely the same syntactic order as Turkish.

DüşünüyorUM (Ögreniyorum) **öyleyse varıM** = **Cogito ergo suM** … I think.. so I am present / Old Turkish 'ök,ög' (mind); 'oku' (read, understand); 'ögren' (learn, know, gnos)

English **do, did** … Latin **edo, ut, utta** … Turkish **et, ed, eddi, tan, tu** > **do, did …** / Turkish **ed, edişin (ed-tion), ediyor** (doing), eddi (**did**)

English **is** … Latin **est, es** … Turkish **uş, işte**

English **–ing** … **gett-ing**… Old Turkish and Turkish vernecular **–ing** … **gidering**

Ich (German), **ego** (Greek), **ög** (Turk - mind, ego)

German **bin** = Turkish **ben-im** (I am)

Turkish '**kim**' = "PIE" '**kwo** (who), Latin **qui**

English '**us**', '**we**' … Turkish '**biz-iz**', Turkish "**-us, -uz**" : third-person plural suffix

Turkish '**-yor**', '**-lar**' = English '**are**'

And, for instance, in English sentences such as this: **Having finished our work**, we went home = Bitirdik işimizi, biz gittik eve … (In many such English sentences, the first half of the sentence follows entirely Turkish syntactic order.)

English constructions expressing condition or command also show strong parallels with Turkish syntax.

In my article, I have presented numerous examples demonstrating structural and syntactic correspondences between English and Turkish in terms of basic sentence components. (4)

As for the alphabet, anyone examining the resemblance between the Turkic runic script and the Old Germanic or Scandinavian runic systems can easily recognize their structural affinity.

We have repeatedly demonstrated that the Old Etruscan alphabet, and later the Latin alphabet derived from it, share multiple characters with the Turkic runic script. Like the Latin language itself, the Latin alphabet is of Turkic origin. The letters **O-U, I- İ** carry a common secret in many languages, especially in Turkish. (7)

THE OBJECTION: “HOW COULD EUROPEANS HAVE ADOPTED THE TURKIC LANGUAGE?”

The common objection goes: “How could the peoples of Europe have adopted the Turkic language and then slightly modified it into their own? By what mechanism could such a transformation have occurred? That seems impossible.”

My answer is: **They did not adopt the Turkic language — already it was originally their own. They migrated to Europe with their Turkic languages.** Over centuries of continuous interaction and intermixing with one another and with other peoples (many of whom were also Turkic), new ethnic and linguistic formations emerged.

How do we know this? Until about 30–40 years ago, we inferred it from the ancient migration maps of humankind, from early historical sources and classical authors, from archaeological evidence, and from tracing cultural, religious, and mythological parallels.

But in recent decades, thanks to advances in genetic research, these hypotheses can now be supported with laboratory data as well.

The thesis I refer to here — namely, that the ancestors of European peoples were of Turkic origin — is based on the story of the R1b and, additionally, the R1a haplogroups. **R1b is a Turkic genetic marker and the dominant haplogroup among Western European populations.** R1a, a Slavic–Turkic mixed Turkic haplogroup, is likewise widespread across Europe. Other major European genetic groups are likewise related to Turkic lineages.

For a detailed exposition of these arguments, see my related papers (8, 9).

THE “INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES ARE OLDER” FALLACY

Among all these fallacies, this one has somewhat fewer defenders — yet it persists. It is, however, a belief entirely contrary to historical development.

Most scholars in the past understood perfectly well that agglutinative Turanian languages were much older than inflected languages. However, more recently, self-described "scientists" have effectively reshaped the

memory of linguistics. Now, no matter what they invent, they continue to share these beliefs among themselves as if they were universally accepted knowledge from ancient times. The totalitarian power of the majority mediocracy.

This fallacy reinforces another: the claim that Turkish is a “new” language, no more than 1,500 years old.

THE “TURKISH IS A NEW LANGUAGE” FALLACY

For a long time, scholars asserted that the first written document in Turkish was the Göktürk inscriptions, dating from around the 8th century CE.

Even after a brief Turkish text dating to the 4th century BCE was discovered, most of academia either rejected it or ignored it.

Thus they concluded: Turkish is a language of at most 1,400–1,500 years’ duration — whereas Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit are far older.

I have disproved this claim by publishing hundreds of lexical parallels between Native American languages and Turkish. Since the ancestors of Native Americans spoke Turkic languages in Asia before migrating to the Americas some 20–25 thousand years ago, Turkish must be at least 25,000 years old. (10, 11)

Moreover, the earliest written example of Turkish is not the Göktürk (Orkhon) inscriptions. **The world’s first writing system — the Sumerian script — was Turkic in origin.**

Many prominent scholars of the 19th century, such as **Lenormant, Oppert**, and **Wooley**, then **Hommel** explicitly identified the Sumerians as Turkic. Since then, numerous studies have demonstrated hundreds of lexical and structural correspondences between Turkish and Sumerian. (12)

Furthermore, both Greek and Latin contain dense Turkic elements.

The ancestors of the Greeks were the Pelasgians — a branch of the Saka Turks — and the ancestors of the Latins were the Etruscans, descended from the people of Troy (13, 14).

THE “THIS IS A TURKISH NATIONALIST THESIS” FALLACY

Ironically, the vast majority of Turkish nationalists themselves are far from understanding or accepting these theses. When explained to them, they tend to reject them outright.

Their cultural nationalism remains confined within the conceptual boundaries set by dominant Western ideologies of the last century. They may praise the Turkish language, yet to them it is merely a limited, isolated “Altaic” tongue that reached Anatolia only in 1071 CE.

The real originators of these theses are in fact Western scholars of the past — those who wrote that Turanian or Turkic peoples had once dominated vast regions of Asia and Europe, and that they shaped both the European nations and their languages… **Lagerbring, Sturluson, Boxhorn, Payne, Cahun, Fergusson, Franklin, Lenormant, Edlinger, Alinei**, and many others… Their works, as well as those of later Western researchers who knowingly or unknowingly continued their line of thought, form the intellectual ancestry of these ideas.

I have summarized the views of 227 such Western scholars in one of my papers (15).

In this light, even the efforts of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Türkiye, who in the 1930s initiated a scientific revival of Turkish

history and linguistics based on these principles, were obstructed by his own compatriots. After his death, his works were suppressed, and discussion of them was effectively prohibited.

Therefore, the claim that our argument is a “Turkist” or “nationalist” thesis is itself a racist fallacy. Our arguments are universal scientific theses. If accepted even partially, they have the potential to transform the cultural climate of the world — and in a profoundly positive way. The persistent efforts to suppress them arise precisely from this fear.

THE LIST FOR FURTHER READING

1- Dictionary of Turkish Roots in Western Languages

https://www.academia.edu/111458574/DICTIONARY_OF_TURKISH_ROOTS_IN_WESTERN_LANGUAGES

2- INTENSE RACISM IN LINGUISTICS: ITS THEORETICAL, HISTORICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ROOTS

https://www.academia.edu/108530582/INTENSE_RACISM_IN_LINGUISTICS_ITS_THEORETICAL_HISTORICAL_AND_PSYCHOLOGICAL_ROOTS

3- Celtic and Laz: The closest relatives of Turkish… King Arthur, Excalibur, Dalai Lama etc.

https://www.academia.edu/82493709/Celtic_and_Laz_The_closest_relatives_of_Turkish_King_Arthur_Excalibur_Dalai_Lama_etc

4- Grammer versus Grammer / The "Indo-European" Syntax, Derived from Turkish Syntax, Constitutes a Historical Regression in Language

https://www.academia.edu/115357742/Grammer_versus_Grammer_The_Indo_European_Syntax_Derived_from_Turkish_Syntax_Constitutes_a_Historical_Regression_in_Language

5- The Vast Majority of Roots Called "Indo-European" are Turkish

https://www.academia.edu/100093705/The_Vast_Majority_of_Roots_Called_Indo_European_are_Turkish

6- Transition Laws of Turkish as a Founding Language to Indo-European and Other Languages

https://www.academia.edu/85054513/Transition_Laws_of_Turkish_as_a_Founding_Language_to_Indo_European_and_Other_Languages

7- Ancient Harmony of Etruscan -Latin Alphabets with Turkish and Turkish Alphabets and the Magic of I-O-U Letters

https://www.academia.edu/86406588/Ancient_Harmony_of_Etruscan_Latin_Alphabets_with_Turkish_and_Turkish_Alphabets_and_the_Magic_of_I_O_U_Letters

8- The Endless Oedipus Complex of European Peoples Who Deny Their Turkish Father: The Obvious Turkish Genes in European Nations

https://www.academia.edu/143551691/The_Endless_Oedipus_Complex_of_European_Peoples_Who_Deny_Their_Turkish_Father_The_Obvious_Turkish_Genes_in_European_Nations

9- The Genetic History of Europeans and Turks... Are Turks Blond or Brunette

https://www.academia.edu/116979715/The_Genetic_History_of_Europeans_and_Turks_Are_Turks_Blond_or_Brunette

10- Proving that the root of Hittite is Turkish by Native American Languages verification

https://www.academia.edu/91093267/Proving_that_the_root_of_Hittite_is_Turkish_by_Native_American_Languages_verification

11- What does the definit commonality of Turkish and Native American as the oldest languages prove?

https://www.academia.edu/96648620/What_does_the_definit_commonality_of_Turkish_and_Native_American_as_the_oldest_languages_prove

12- Breaking an Indo-European disinformation myth: Sumerian is Turkic

https://www.academia.edu/74539984/Breaking_an_Indo_European_disinformation_myth_Sumerian_is_Turkic

13- Greek Language Derived from Turkish... Why Is This Obvious Fact Not Seen

https://www.academia.edu/120327612/Greek_Language_Derived_from_Turkish_Why_Is_This_Obvious_Fact_Not_Seen

14- Isn't that also another conspiracy? Mario Alinei: Etruscans were Turks

https://www.academia.edu/87942929/Isnt_that_also_another_conspiracy_Mario_Alinei_Etruscans_were_Turks

15- The 300 Spartans: International Scholars Identifying Turkic Roots in European Languages

https://www.academia.edu/129610934/The_300_Spartans_International_Scholars_Identifying_Turkic_Roots_in_European_Languages